

Remarks

The present response amends claim 1, adds new claims 22-30 and requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Claims 11-15 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable based on Milligan. This rejection is traversed.

Independent claim 11 is amended herein to recite a branched polysiloxane. The cited reference specifically identifies only linear polysiloxanes. 7:35. This, combined with the disclosure of many different possible polysiloxanes in columns 6-7 of the patent, would not serve to lead the skilled artisan to the claimed invention. See, e.g., In re Baird, 29 USPQ2d 1550 (Fed. Cir. 1994) and In re Belle, 991 F.2d 781, 26 USPQ2d 1529 (Fed. Cir. 1993), which is cited therein at page 1552.

New claims 22-30 are added. They differ from original claims 11-19 in that the claimed molecular weight of the polysiloxane is "500 to less than 2000". This recitation is supported by the specification, e.g., p. 4, ll. 4-5.

These new claims are also not obvious based on Milligan because the claimed molecular weight range upper limit of the polysiloxane of "less than 2000" has the distinct benefit of resulting in the production of a composition requiring "few if any additional solvents to achieve application viscosity." P. 4, ll. 6-7. In contrast, in Milligan, the upper limit of the molecular weight range of the polysiloxane is 310, 000 (7:56) and is preferably "at least 5000, advantageously at least 10 000, and more especially at least 15 000." 7:58-59.

A Terminal disclaimer is submitted herewith to overcome the rejection based on 6,743,854.

In accordance with the above discussion, withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'L. E. Parker', written over a horizontal line.

Lainie E. Parker
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 36,123

Akzo Nobel Inc.
Intellectual Property Dept.
7 Livingstone Avenue
Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522-3408
(914) 674-5466